

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/837, 459 04/18/97 MCKEE

M 4995.0023

EXAMINER

HM12/0517  
FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT &  
DUNNER  
1300 I STREET NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3315

PORTNER, V	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1645  
DATE MAILED:

29

05/17/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/837,459	4/18/97	McKee	7787.0023

EXAMINER

Portner

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1645 29

DATE MAILED:

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ms. Laura L Boone (App Rep) G. Portner (PTO)  
(2) Mr. Allen Jensen (App. Rep)

Date of Interview 5-15-01Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No If yes, brief description:

Dean-Nystrom et al "Passive Protection of Suckling piglets from Escherichia coli O157:H7 infection by vaccination of Pregnant Sows with mimim"

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: all of recordIdentification of prior art discussed: all of record

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed how to define over Cravots et al, Claim limitation drawn to administration of enriched or purified intimin would define over this ref. Discussed Douglas relative to Dean-Nystrom et al abstract. New claims

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

Portner 5/15/01